UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,022	02/26/2002	Helmut Haning	Le A 35 206	8681

7590 06/30/2003

Jeffrey M. Greenman
Vice President, Patents and Licensing
Bayer Corporation
400 Morgan Lane
West Haven, CT 06516

EXAMINER	
HABTE, KAHSAY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/082,022	Applicant(s) HANING ET AL.	
	Examiner Kahsay Habte, Ph. D.	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-14 are pending.

Election/Restriction

2. Applicant's election of Group VI (i.e. R^6 in Formula (I) forms phenyl), Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-14 is acknowledged.

3. The claims are drawn to multiple inventions for reasons set forth in the restriction requirement. The claims are examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention. Cancellation of the non-elected subject matter is recommended in response to this Office Action. Applicants are required to delete any substituents on R^9, R^{10}, R^{11}, R^{12}, R^{13} or R^{14} that does not form phenyl. For example, for R^9 the substituent (such as (C1-C10)- alkyl, (C3-C8)-cycloalkyl, (C7-C10)-aryl, (C7-C10)-arylmethyl, or the heterocyclic ring, should be deleted. Applicants have to limit R^9 to C6 aryl or R^9 to C6 arylmethyl. Like wise the same amendment is required for R^{10}, R^{11}, R^{12}, R^{13} or R^{14}.

Abstract

4. The abstract is not descriptive. It is recommended that applicants draw the chemical structure and the definitions of variables Z, A and R^{36} instead of "novel diphenyl derivatives." It is also recommended that applicants include the specific utility instead of using a broader term "medicament."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apelqvist et al. (WO 00/07972). The cited reference teaches the synthesis of diphenyl derivatives linked by –O- and benzoyl attached at 2 position (see Formula I, X-R^4 = CO-phenyl in the front page). Scheme 1 and 2 (on page 9 of the specification) also teaches the synthesis of groups of compounds that are the same as applicants except that R^3 is at 2-position. Applicant's formula (I) requires that R^3 is be at 3-position. Many of the species in Examples 1-55 are almost the same as applicants. For example, the species in Example 2 [4-(2-benzoyl-5-isopropyl-4-methoxy-phenoxy)-3,5-dibromo-phenyl]acetic acid methyl ester {structure of scheme 1, where R_1= R_2= Br, R_3= Benzoyl , n=1, (page 9)}.

Said species is almost the same as applicants when applicant's formula (I) has the following substituents:

R7 = Methyl, R5 = isopropyl, R3= R4 = Br, R1= R2 = H, Z = -CH2-CO-O-Methyl, X = O.

The only difference is that R6 (benzoyl) of applicant's formula (I) is attached at 3 - position. It is well established that position isomers are prima facie structurally obvious

even in the absence of a teaching to modify. The isomer is expected to be preparable by the same method and to have generally the same properties. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing the position isomers. This circumstance has arisen many times. See: *Ex parte Englehardt,* 208 USPQ 343, 349; *In re Mehta,* 146 USPQ 284, 287; *In re Surrey,* 138 USPQ 67; *Ex Parte Ullyot,* 103 USPQ 185; *In re Norris,* 84 USPQ 459; *Ex Parte Naito,* 168 USPQ 437, 439; *Ex parte Allais,* 152 USPQ 66; *In re Wilder,* 166 USPQ 545, 548; *Ex parte Henkel,* 130 USPQ 474; *Ex parte Biel,* 124 USPQ 109; *In re Petrzilka,* 165 USPQ 327; *In re Crownse,* 150 USPQ 554; *In re Fouche,* 169 USPQ 431; *Ex parte Ruddy,* 121 USPQ 427; *In re Wiechert,* 152 USPQ 249, *In re Shetty*, 195 USPQ 753.

For example, "Position isomerism has been used as a tool to obtain new and useful drugs" (Englehardt) and "Position isomerism is a fact of close structural similarity" (Mehta, emphasis in the original). See also MPEP 2144.09, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

invention. There has been recited in claims 11-13 a method of preventing arteriosclerosis, obesity or hypercholesterolaemia, diseases that cab be treated with natural thyroid hormone, but the specification is not enabled for such a scope. To this day, the only possible way available is to treat said diseases but not preventing someone from having said diseases at first place.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:

a. Claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are rejected because the phrase "general formula" is indefinite. A formula should be specific but not "general". It is required that applicants delete "general" from the claims.

b. Regarding claims 4, the phrase "in particular" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

c. In claim 12, there has been recited a method of treating disease forms which can be treated with natural thyroid hormone. The scope of claim 12 is unknown. Which diseases are these? Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to such mediator will surely involve undue experimentation. Suppose that a given compound X when administered to a patient with Disease D does not obtain a response. Does one then conclude that Disease D does not fall within this claim? Keep in mind that:

A. It may be that the next patient will respond. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work only with some people, not all. Thus, how many need to be tested?

B. It may be that the wrong dosage or dosage regimen was employed. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work at one dosage, but not at another which is significantly higher or lower. Furthermore, the dosage regimen may be vital --- should the drug be given e.g. once a day, or four times in divided dosages? Thus, how many dosages and dosage regimens must be tried before one is certain that this pharmaceutical won't affect Disease D?

C. It may be that X simply isn't potent enough for Disease D, but that another inhibitor Y is potent enough, so that D really does fall within the claim. Thus, how many different mediators must be tried before one concludes that D doesn't fall within the claim?

D. Conversely, if D responds to Y but not to X, can one really conclude that D falls within the claim? It may be that the X result is giving the accurate answer, and that

the success of Y arises from some other unknown property which Y is capable of. Thus, when mixed results are obtained, how many more pharmaceuticals need be tested?

E. Finally, suppose that X really will work, but only when combined with Z. There are for example, agents in the antiviral and anticancer technology which are not themselves effective, but the disease will respond when the agents are combined with something else.

F. In addition, literally speaking, any disorder can be treated with any drug, although the treatment might not be successful. Assuming that "successful treatment" is what is intended, what criterion is to be used? If one person in 10 responds to a given drug, does that mean that the disease is treatable? One in 100? 1,000? 10,000?

As a result, determining the true scope of the claim will involve extensive and potentially open-ended research. Without it, one skilled in the art cannot determine the actual scope of the claim. Hence, the claim is indefinite.

d. In claim 13, the phrase "prophylaxis of disorders" is indefinite. Prophylaxis of what disorders? What are covered and what are not?

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte, Ph. D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-4717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00AM- 5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 703-308-4716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

Kahsay Habte, Ph. D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1624

Mark L. Berch
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

KH
June 27, 2003